


September 14, 1999

Ms. Mary Ann Wright Associate Director, Mining Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining 1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210 P.O. Box 145801 Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801

> Re: Geneva Steel Company Iron County Operations M/021/008



Dear Ms. Wright:

This is in response to your request for a letter confirming Geneva Steel Company's ongoing suspension of mining operations at its Iron County properties.

Geneva suspended iron mining operations in southern Utah on December 29, 1995, about 3.5 years ago. Since then Geneva has been using iron ore pellets from a source in Minnesota. The pellets work well with Geneva's current steelmaking technology, but are relatively expensive both in terms of raw material costs and transportation costs as compared to southern Utah ore. For a number of years Geneva has been analyzing various other more cost effective technologies, including direct iron reduction processes, and is currently focusing on one that is readily compatible with the use of southern Utah ore. It is Geneva's intention to use the most cost efficient process available, and hopefully to resume use of southern Utah ore within the next several years.

In that regard Geneva has entered into a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Department of Energy to construct a billion dollar facility capable of producing 3,300 tons of hot iron per day for 30 years using the HIsmelt® direct ironmaking process. This new process has significant environmental benefits. It would also allow Geneva to utilize large quantities of low cost Utah coal and would help ensure Geneva's long-term profitability. Enclosed for your information is a copy of a recent article from the Salt Lake Tribune discussing the project and an excerpt from the June 28, 1999 Federal Register discussing the project in more detail, including the DOE's plans to commence an environmental impact statement for the project.

Ms. Mary Ann Wright
September 14, 1999
Page 2

While the mining
temporarily suspended
property has continu
Transportation mined
improvement purposes

As you know, Gen
of the bankruptcy c
continued dumping by
not terminated Geneva
intention to resume to
bankruptcy proceeding
place to secure Gene
United Pacific Insura
to complete its ban
Congress has taken so

While the mining of iron ore from Geneva's property has been temporarily suspended, intermittent mining of waste rock from the property has continued. Most recently, the Utah Department of Transportation mined waste rock from the property for highway improvement purposes during the spring of 1998.

As you know, Geneva filed for reorganization under chapter 11 of the bankruptcy code on February 1, 1999, due primarily to continued dumping by foreign steel producers. This has slowed but not terminated Geneva's modernization plans. It remains Geneva's intention to resume use of southern Utah ore in the future. The bankruptcy proceeding will not affect the reclamation bond now in place to secure Geneva's reclamation obligations (No. U2771399, United Pacific Insurance Company, \$1,073,000.00). Geneva expects to complete its bankruptcy reorganization in the near future. Congress has taken some steps to alleviate the dumping of foreign steel, and Geneva recently recalled 200 workers because of increased steel orders.

Nevertheless, inasmuch as Geneva's suspension of iron mining operations in southern Utah may continue beyond the five-year mark, this letter will serve as notice, in accordance with Utah Code Ann. § 40-8-21(1) and Utah Admin. Code R647-4-117.3, of the same.

If your office has any further questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Clyde Gabbitas Sr. Manager, Mines

Enclosures



Tribune Archive 1999 (1/99 - 7/99)

➡ Business Digest ... 07/17/1999

The Salt Lake Tribune

Date: 07/17/1999 Edition: Final Section: Business Page: D4

Keywords: Briefs; Businesses; UT

Subject: Economy, Business and Finance Art Caption: Market Indicators

Business Digest

₩Geneva Proposes Adding

\$1 Billion Iron-maker

Geneva Steel, which filed for bankruptcy in February, now wants to add a \$1 billion iron-making facility. Company and federal government officials hope the proposed addition will redefine clean air standards for burning coal.

"What it will ensure is long-term viability," said Reginald Wintrell, a chief engineer for Geneva. "We're excited about it. Once we get this in place, (Geneva's) going to be here at least 30 years and be competitive with anybody."

Wintrell's comments came at a Thursday meeting hosted by the U.S. Department of Energy, which has formed a number of other partnerships with the private sector as part of its \$5.7 billion search for ways to both encourage the coal-based industry and minimize hazardous emissions associated with the commodity.

Wintrell said Utah has more than 400 billion tons of coal, but Geneva can't use it because it is low-quality, considered an inefficient energy source for making iron and steel.

But with their recent plans for a 17-acre, state-of-the-art iron-making plant, Geneva is confident that its new energy-efficient equipment will essentially allow low-quality coals to perform like high-quality coals.

Wintrell predicted that sophisticated plants like the one Geneva is planning "will eliminate (U.S.) dependency on foreign coals "

Geneva will split the \$850 million price tag of the new facility with several other unnamed partners, and the structure would not be built until about 2003 and would then be subjected to a 30-month test period.

An environmental impact study on the project will be finished by October 2000 at the earliest.

2 Named Friends of Ag

The former Utah director of the Bureau of Land Management and the state Agriculture in the Classroom coordinator have been named "Friends of Agriculture" by the Utah Farm Bureau Federation.

The annual awards were presented this week at the Farm Bureau's midyear conference in Park City.

Bill Lamb's career with the government spanned 36 years as a range scientist and administrator. He spent four years as state BLM director before retiring in April.

Among other areas, Lamb worked with ranchers, planning how to improve the range.

Debra Spielmaker, an assistant professor at Utah State University, has a background in teaching agriculture science

She traveled the state training other teachers to help students understand where their food and fiber comes from. Chamber Seeks Nominations

The Salt Lake Area Chamber of Commerce is seeking nominations for the 14th-annual Athena Businesswoman of the Year award.

The honor is presented annually to a woman who demonstrates leadership in her field or business, supports other professionals, provides service to the community and is an active member of the chamber.

Applications will be accepted through July 30, and can be obtained by calling 364-3631.

The award will be presented at the Women & Business Conference on Oct. 13.

© Copyright 1990-1999, The Salt Lake Tribune

All articles and other materials found in TribAccess, The Salt Lake Tribune's Web archives are copyrighted *The Salt Lake Tribune* and associated news services. No material from these archives may be reproduced, compiled or reused without explicit permission from *The Salt Lake Tribune*.



9/Not

on the World Wide Web at either of the following sites:

http://www.ocfo.ed.gov/fedreg.htm http://www.ed.gov/news.html To use pdf you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader Program with search, which is available free at either of the preceding sites. If you have questions about using pdf, call the U.S. Government Printing Office, toll free, at 1–888–293–6498.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the Federal Register.

Program Authority: 20 USC 1138-1138d; Public Law 105-277, 112 Stat. 2681, 2681-371.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 84.116X, Office of Postsecondary Education, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities— Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Models on College Campuses Grant Competition)

Dated: June 23, 1999.

Judith Johnson,

Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Claudio R. Prieto,

Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Postsecondary Education.

[FR Doc. 99–16408 Filed 6–25–99; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Clean Power From Integrated Coal/Ore Reduction (CPICOR) Project

AGENCY: U.S. Department of Energy. **ACTION:** Notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) announces its intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321, et seq.), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and the DOE NEPA regulations (10 CFR Part 1021), to assess the potential environmental and human health impacts of a proposed project under the Clean Coal Technology Program that would integrate the production of molten iron for steelmaking with the production of electricity. The Clean Power from Integrated Coal/Ore Reduction (CPICOR) project, proposed to be located within the Geneva Steel Company's existing plant at Vineyard, Utah, would demonstrate the integration of the High

Intensity Smelting (HIsmelt®) ironmaking process with technology to generate electricity using steam heated by combustion gas from the HIsmelt® process. The EIS will help DOE decide whether to provide 15% of the funding for the \$1 billion proposed project.

The purpose of this Notice of Intent is to inform the public about the proposed action; present the schedule for the action; announce the plans for a public scoping meeting; invite public participation in (and explain) the scoping process that DOE will follow to comply with the requirements of NEPA; and solicit public comments for consideration in establishing the proposed scope and content of the EIS. The EIS will evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed project and reasonable alternatives.

DATES: To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposal is addressed, DOE invites comments on the proposed scope and content of the EIS from all interested parties. All comments must be received by August 16, 1999, to ensure consideration. Late comments will be considered to the extent practicable. In addition to receiving comments in writing and by telephone, DOE will conduct a public scoping meeting in which agencies, organizations, and the general public are invited to present oral comments or suggestions with regard to the range of actions, alternatives, and impacts to be considered in the EIS. The scoping meeting will be held at the Council Chambers of the Provo City Center, 351 W. Center Street, Provo, Utah, at 7 p.m. on Thursday, July 15, 1999. In addition, DOE will host an informational session for interested parties from 5 p.m. until 7 p.m. on the day of the meeting at the Council Chambers. Displays and other forms of information about the proposed project and its location will be available, and DOE personnel will be available to answer questions. The public is invited to this informal session to learn more about the proposed project.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and requests to participate in the public scoping process should be addressed to: Mr. Joseph Renk, NEPA Document Manager, U.S. Department of Energy, Federal Energy Technology Center, P.O. Box 10940, Pittsburgh, PA 15236–0940.

Individuals who would like to provide comments and/or otherwise participate in the public scoping process should contact Mr. Renk directly at telephone 412–892–6249; fax 412–892–4775; e-mail renk@fetc.doe.gov; or by recorded message at toll-free number 1–800–276–9851.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To obtain additional information about this project or to receive a copy of the draft EIS when it is issued, contact Mr. Joseph Renk at the address provided above. For general information on the DOE NEPA process, please contact: Ms. Carol M. Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance (EH–42), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20585–0119, 202–586–4600; or leave a message at 1–800–472–2756.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background and Need for Agency Action

Under Public Law 102-154, the U.S. Congress provided authorization and funds to DOE for conducting cost-shared Clean Coal Technology (CCT) Program projects for the design, construction, and operation of facilities that "* * shall advance significantly the efficiency and environmental performance of coal-using technologies and be applicable to either new or existing facilities * * *" Under a solicitation in 1992 pursuant to this law (Round V of the CCT Program) and a subsequent appropriation (Public Law 101-512), DOE selected for further consideration for cost-shared funding a proposal from the CPICOR Management Company for design, construction, and operation of a process to integrate production of molten iron for steelmaking with production of electricity for utility distribution.

The demonstration of the CPICOR project under the CCT Program would fulfill an existing programmatic need. Although substantial deposits of coal exist as a resource suitable for and capable of resolving critical energy issues, there are a number of obstacles that present barriers to its increased use. These impediments include: (1) Concerns about environmental issues, such as acid deposition, global climate change, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon emissions, and solid waste; (2) commercial demonstration of acceptable coal use technologies; and (3) technical and economic performance of the technologies. Thus, since the early 1970's, DOE and its predecessor agencies have pursued research and development programs that have included long-term, high-risk activities to support the development of a wide variety of innovative coal technologies through the proof-of-concept stage.

However, the availability of a technology at the proof-of-concept stage is not sufficient to ensure its continued development and subsequent commercialization. Before any

technology can be seriously considered for commercialization, it must be demonstrated. The financial risk associated with technology demonstration is, in general, too high for the private sector to assume without strong incentives or legal requirements. The CCT Program was established by Congress and endorsed by the private sector as a way to accelerate the development of innovative technologies to meet the nation's near-term energy and environmental goals, to reduce the business community's investment risk to an acceptable level, and to provide incentives for the private sector to pursue innovative research and development directed at providing solutions to long-range energy supply problems.

Proposed Action

The proposed action is for DOE to provide, through a cooperative agreement with the CPICOR Management Company, cost-shared financial assistance for the design, construction, and operation of the proposed project as described below. The project would cost approximately \$1 billion; DOE's share would be nearly \$150 million (15%). The proposed project would be located at the existing Geneva Steel Company facilities in

Vineyard, Utah.

The CPICOR project would demonstrate the integration of the HIsmelt® ironmaking process with technology for power generation. The HIsmelt ® process produces molten iron directly from iron ore and coal in a single integrated operation without any intermediate steps. In contrast, conventional ironmaking technology practiced today requires two separate processes: (1) Initial production of coke from coal in sequential coal charging, coking (heating coal in the absence of air to drive off volatile organic compounds), and coke removal and quenching operations, which result in emissions of particulate matter and hazardous air pollutants (e.g., polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons); and (2) subsequent use of the produced coke as both a heat source and a reducing agent in a blast furnace with iron ore and limestone to reduce the iron ore to molten iron

The CPICOR project would produce 3,300 tons per day of molten iron and up to 160 megawatts of electricity (MWe). To produce molten iron, iron ore, coal, and oxygen-enriched hot air would be injected into a closed HIsmelt ® molten-bath reactor, which would minimize hazardous air pollutant emissions. The metal bath is the primary reaction medium in which

carbon from the coal would reduce iron ore to iron. Molten iron that collects in the bottom of the bath would be continuously tapped from the vessel to maintain a constant level of iron inside the vessel. Slag, would be tapped periodically and used to coat and control the internal cooling system and reduce heat loss.

Based on equivalent production of iron, the HIsmelt® technology is capable of reducing sulfur dioxide emissions by over 85%, oxides of nitrogen by 35%, and particulate matter by over 85%, when compared to conventional ironmaking technology. Desulfurization would occur through reaction of sulfur in the reducing gas with limestone/dolomite additives. The reducing atmosphere in the HIsmelt® process would minimize the formation of oxides of nitrogen. Another environmental benefit of the HIsmelt® process is its ability to process iron oxide wastes (called reverts) produced from conventional iron and steel production. The Geneva Steel site, as well as many other U.S. ironmaking sites, currently houses large inventories of reverts.

In addition to the HIsmelt® unit, the plant would include such new facilities as: an air separation unit to provide approximately 1,000 tons of oxygen per day; a boiler to generate steam; a steam turbine generator to produce electricity; a wet scrubber gas cleaning system to remove particulate matter; and all necessary auxiliary systems. Gas produced in the HIsmelt® unit would be combusted in the boiler to produce: (1) 5,500 tons per day of steam for inplant use by Geneva Steel and (2) additional steam required to drive a 160-MWe steam turbine. About 140 MWe would be used for internal process needs at the Geneva Steel facilities and the remaining 20 MWe would be available for export to the existing power grid. Following a successful demonstration of the CPICOR project, it is anticipated that the existing coke ovens at the Geneva Steel site would not be replaced as they reach the end of their useful life.

The CPICOR project would occupy approximately 17 acres of previously disturbed land at the Geneva Steel site, and an additional 8 acres of previously disturbed land would be used during construction for laydown, fabrication, and storage areas. Most construction would be related to the HIsmelt ® unit, the air separation unit, and the power plant unit. Extension of conveyors to transport coal and other feedstocks to the HIsmelt ® unit would be required, along with a new raw material storage facility. Control rooms for the HIsmelt ®,

air separation, and power plant units would be required. Wherever possible, existing facilities and infrastructure located at the Geneva Steel site would be used for the CPICOR project. These include railway lines/spurs, coal rotary dumpsters, conveyors, day bins, slag handling facilities, and water distribution and wastewater treatment

systems.

Project activities would include engineering and design, permitting, procurement, construction, start-up, and demonstration. Assuming timely delivery from the CPICOR project team of the environmental information necessary for developing the EIS, DOE anticipates a 15-month schedule (from date of publication of this Notice of Intent) to complete the EIS and issue a Record of Decision. Upon completing its NEPA review, if DOE decides to implement the proposed action, construction would commence in the year 2001 and demonstration would begin in the year 2003. Verification of the commercial feasibility of the technology would be accomplished through a 30-month test program, during which the plant would be operated on several different types of coal, to test and demonstrate the viability of the technology. Upon completing the demonstration program for DOE, the facility would continue to operate as part of Geneva Steel's commercial plant. The facility would be designed for a lifetime of 30 years.

Alternatives

Section 102(2)(C) of NEPA requires that agencies discuss the reasonable alternatives to the proposed action in an EIS. The purpose for agency action determines the range of reasonable alternatives. Congress established the CCT Program and directed DOE to pursue the goals of the legislation by soliciting proposals and partially funding (cost sharing) projects owned and controlled by non-Federal government sponsors. This statutory requirement places DOE in a much more limited role than if the Federal government were the owner and operator of the project. In the latter situation, DOE would be responsible for a comprehensive review of reasonable alternatives. However, in dealing with an applicant, the scope of alternatives is necessarily more restricted. It is appropriate in such cases for DOE to give substantial weight to the applicant's needs in establishing a project's reasonable alternatives.

An overall strategy for compliance with NEPA was developed for the CCT Program that includes consideration of both programmatic and project-specific environmental impacts during and after the process of selecting a project. As part of the NEPA strategy, the EIS for the proposed CPICOR project will tier off the Program's final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) that was issued by DOE in November 1989 (DOE/EIS-0146). Two alternatives were evaluated in the PEIS: (1) the noaction alternative, which assumed that the CCT Program was not continued and that conventional coal-fired technologies with flue gas desulfurization and nitrogen oxide controls to meet New Source Performance Standards would continue to be used; and (2) the proposed action, which assumed that the clean coal projects would be selected and funded, and that successfully demonstrated technologies would undergo widespread commercialization by the year 2010.

The range of reasonable alternatives to be considered in the EIS for the proposed CPICOR project is also narrowed in accordance with the overall NEPA strategy. The EIS will include an analysis of the no-action alternative as a reasonable alternative to the proposed action of providing cost-shared funding support for the proposed project. DOE will consider other reasonable alternatives that may be suggested during the public scoping period.

Under the no-action alternative, DOE would not provide partial funding for the design, construction, and operation of the CPICOR project. In the absence of DOE funding, the CPICOR project probably would not be constructed; therefore, potential environmental impacts or benefits related to its demonstration would not be realized. In addition, the project would not contribute to the general objective of the CCT Program, which is to make available to the U.S. energy marketplace a number of advanced, more efficient, economically feasible, and environmentally acceptable coal technologies.

If the CPICOR facility is not built, other reasonable alternatives for producing coke and molten iron would need to be adopted by Geneva Steel. While the option to do nothing (i.e., continue to operate the blast furnaces using coke) is perhaps the most likely, especially in the near future, it is undesirable because Geneva Steel's coke-making capacity is declining, which would eventually lead to a total dependence on imported coke for iron production. Another option would be to modernize existing blast furnaces to lessen the requirements for coke and to install new coke-making facilities with state-of-the-art pollution controls that are needed to comply with the National

Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants. In the EIS, DOE will consider both of these options under the no-action alternative.

Because of DOE's limited role of providing cost-shared funding for the proposed CPICOR project, and because of the advantages associated with the proposed location, DOE does not plan to evaluate alternative sites for the proposed project. The project participants initially considered additional sites during their site selection process. Site selection was governed primarily by benefits that could be realized by the companies participating in the project. An existing plant site was preferred because the cost associated with construction of the project at a "greenfield" site in an undisturbed area would be much higher and the environmental impacts likely would be much greater than at an existing facility. The site selected for the project had to provide the maximum benefit to the companies by closely meeting the project's technical needs and integrating with existing infrastructure. Because Geneva Steel Company's only facility is located at Vineyard, Utah, no other sites were considered after Geneva Steel was selected as the ironmaking partner for the project.

The existing Geneva Steel plant has several advantages because it is an operating plant with land available for installation of new facilities, and likely would have less impact associated with construction and operation of the facilities. Much of the infrastructure needed for the facilities, including the electric transmission lines and towers. is already in place at the Geneva Steel plant. The molten iron produced by the project can be used in its liquid form at the steel mill. If not sited at a steel mill location, pig iron would need to be produced, which would add a processing step and increase costs. Since pig iron is not a finished product, it would need to be remelted, thus decreasing overall energy efficiency.

Preliminary Identification of Environmental Issues

The following issues have been tentatively identified for analysis in the EIS. This list is not intended to be all inclusive or a predetermined set of potential impacts, but is presented to facilitate public comment on the scope of the EIS. Additions to or deletions from this list may occur as a result of the scoping process. The issues include:

(1) Atmospheric Resources: potential air quality and human health impacts on areas and populations surrounding

the site resulting from emissions during current and future facility operations;

(2) Water Resources: potential effects on surface water and groundwater resources consumed and discharged;

(3) Infrastructure and Land Use: potential consequences to land, utilities, transportation routes, and traffic patterns resulting from the proposed project, in particular, due to changes in the amounts of coal and iron ore required;

(4) Solid Waste: pollution prevention and waste management practices, including impacts caused by the generation, treatment, transport, storage, and disposal of solid wastes;

(5) Construction: impacts associated with noise, traffic patterns, and construction-related emissions;

(6) Environmental Justice: potential for disproportionately high and adverse impacts on low-income and minority populations in the surrounding community;

(7) Visual: impacts associated with new structures associated with the proposed project; and

(8) Cumulative effects: incremental impacts of the proposed project when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (e.g., incremental air emissions affecting air quality and human health).

Public Scoping Process

To ensure that all issues related to this proposal are addressed, DOE will conduct an open process to define the scope of the EIS. The public scoping period will run until August 16, 1999. Interested agencies, organizations, and the general public are encouraged to submit comments or suggestions concerning the content of the EIS, issues and impacts to be addressed in the EIS, and the alternatives that should be analyzed. Scoping comments should clearly describe specific issues or topics that the EIS should address in order to assist DOE in identifying significant issues.

Written, e-mailed, faxed, or telephoned comments should be communicated by August 16, 1999 (see ADDRESSES in this Notice).

A public scoping meeting to be conducted by DOE will be held in the Council Chambers of the Provo City Center, 351 W. Center Street, Provo, Utah, on Thursday, July 15, 1999, at 7 p.m. In addition, DOE will hold an informational session at the same location from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. on the day of the meeting. Displays and other materials and DOE personnel will be available to provide information about the proposed project.

DOE requests that anyone who wishes to speak at this public scoping meeting contact Mr. Joseph Renk, either by phone, fax, computer, or in writing (see ADDRESSES in this Notice). Individuals who do not make advance arrangements to speak may register at the meeting (preferably at the beginning of the meeting) and will be given the opportunity to speak after all previously scheduled speakers have made their presentations. Speakers who wish to make presentations longer than five minutes should indicate the length of time desired in their request. Depending on the number of speakers, it may be necessary to limit speakers to fiveminute presentations initially, with the opportunity for additional presentations as time permits. Speakers can also provide additional written information to supplement their presentations. Oral and written comments will be given equal consideration.

DOE will begin the meeting with overviews of the proposed CPICOR project and the NEPA process. A presiding officer will be designated by DOE to chair the meeting. The meeting will not be conducted as an evidentiary hearing, and speakers will not be cross-examined. However, speakers may be asked to clarify their statements to ensure that DOE fully understands the comments or suggestions. The presiding officer will establish the order of speakers and provide any additional procedures necessary to conduct the meeting.

Issued in Washington, D.C., this 22nd day of June, 1999.

David Michaels.

Assistant Secretary, Environment, Safety and Health.

[FR Doc. 99–16355 Filed 6–25–99; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP99-556-000]

Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation; Request Under Blanket Authorization

June 22, 1999.

Take notice that on June 14, 1999, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia), 1201 Fair Lakes Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22030–1046, filed in Docket No. CP99–556–000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205, and 157.216, of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 157.216) for

authorization to abandon certain natural gas facilities consisting of 1,772 points of delivery to Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc. (COH) under Columbia's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP83–76–000 pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, all as more fully set forth in the request that is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection. This filing may be viewed on the web at http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm (please call (202) 208–0400 for assistance).

The points of delivery to be abandoned are located on non-jurisdictional pipeline in northern Ohio that are being sold to Gatherco, Inc (Gatherco). Columbia states that Gatherco has agreed to continue providing the service supplied to these points of delivery. Columbia does not propose a reduction or termination of service as a result of the abandonment. COH will instead shift these volumes to other delivery points.

Any questions regarding the application should be directed to Fredric George at (304) 357–2359 or Larry Willeke at (202) 216–9764, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation, 12801 Fair Lakes Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22030–1046.

Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, file pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Procedural Rules (18 CFR 385.214) a motion to intervene or notice of intervention and pursuant to Section 157.205 of the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205) a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefor, the proposed activity shall be deemed to be authorized effective the day after the time allowed for filing a protest. If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act.

David P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–16341 Filed 6–25–99; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP99-337-000]

Discovery Gas Transmission LLC; Tariff Filing

June 22, 1999.

Take notice that on June 17, 1999, Discovery Gas Transmission LLC, (Discovery), tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Original Volume No. 1, Second Revised Sheet No. 131, and Third Revised Sheet No. 196, to become effective August 1, 1999.

Discovery states that the purpose of this filing is to comply with the Commission's order issued April 2, 1999, in Docket No. RM96–1–011.

Discovery states that the instant filing reflects changes to the General Terms and Conditions of its Tariff required to implement standards issued by the Gas Industry Standards Board (GISB) and adopted by the Commission in Order No. 587–K issued April 2, 1999, in Docket No. RM 96–1–011. This filing implements changes required by Commission Regulations Section 284.10(b)(1) (i through v), relating to electronic communication with interstate natural gas pipelines promulgated July 31, 1998, by GISB.

Discovery states that copies of this filing are being mailed to its customers, state commissions and other interested

parties.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.214 or 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests must be filed in accordance with Section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room. This filing may be viewed on the web at http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/ rims.htm (call 202-208-2222 for assistance).

David P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–16351 Filed 6–25–99; 8:45 am]



Geneva Calls 200 Workers Back to Job

Friday, September 10, 1999

BY STEVEN OBERBECK THE SALT LAKE TRIBUNE

EMAIL THIS

Demand for Geneva Steel's products -- particularly hot-rolled band steel -- has grown in recent months to a point where the Vineyard steel maker plans early next week to restart operations at a second blast furnace.

Firing up an additional furnace to increase raw iron production for its steel-making business has been a goal since last September when Geneva shut down the furnace under a deluge of cheap foreign imports that drove down prices and dried up demand.

The flood of imports eventually led Geneva to file for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection early this year.

"Our current orders now exceed our ability to produce at a one-blast-furnace level," Geneva Chairman Joe Cannon said Thursday. "While this is not great news for us, it certainly represents a step in the right direction."

Geneva's workers, though, are ecstatic. The company has called back 200 of its laid-off employees, bringing total employment to approximately 1,675 workers.

They are being put to work at the blast furnance, the rolling mill, the pipe mill and the coke plant to help handle the increased business.

"Things have been gradually improving and that is good news for our members," said Kelly Hansen, financial secretary for United Steelworkers of America Local 2701 in Orem.

Geneva, however, still has about 130 people laid off.

The company credits its improved order book in part to a reduction in imports resulting from the recent round of trade cases brought by U.S. steel makers against countries such as Japan, Korea, Russia and Brazil.

American Iron and Steel Institute spokeswoman Nancy Gravatt said while imports from some countries have started to dry up, trade case results have been mixed for domestic steel producers.

"The huge glut of dumped steel has started to subside, but we are still seeing some relatively high levels of imports coming in from some countries." Gravatt said.

She said domestic steel producers uniformly have been helped by the continuing strength of the U.S. economy, which has resulted in growing demand for manufacturing equipment, tools and other items made from steel.

© Copyright 1999, The Salt Lake Tribune All material found on Utah OnLine is copyrighted The Salt Lake Tribune and associated news services. No material may be reproduced or reused without explicit permission from The Salt Lake Tribune.

AR CALINE THE REGISE CONTINUES TO DIAR BOOKS TRIBIALS TRIBACLES